

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, and 80 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Claims 1-7, 11-17, 21-27, 31-37, 41-47, 51-57, 61-67, and 71-77 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, 51, 61, and 71 are independent. Claims 8-10, 18-20, 28-30, 38-40, 48-50, 58-60, 68-70, and 78-80 have been canceled. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, 51, 61, and 71 have been amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-6, 21-26, 41-46, and 61-66 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 21-26, 41-46, and 61-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. U.S. 2002/0197013 to Liu ("Liu"). A claim is anticipated only if each and every element of the claim is found in a reference. (M.P.E.P. § 2131 *citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Id. citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226,1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Although Applicants believe that claims 1, 21, 41, and 61 are patentable as written, claims 1, 21, 41, and 61 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 8-10, 28-30, 48-50, and 68-70, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 21, 41, and 61 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-6, 22-26, 42-46, and 62-66 properly depend from patentable claims 1, 21, 41 and 61, respectively, and are thus in condition for allowance as well.

Rejection of Claims 11-16, 31-36, 51-56, and 71-76 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Liu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,591,038 to Pezeshki. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, an Examiner must show three things: (1) that there is some suggestion or motivation to modify a reference or combine reference teachings to

arrive at the claimed invention, (2) that there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and (3) that the references teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. (MPEP §2143.) The suggestion or motivation to modify reference teachings must be found in the references relied upon. (MPEP §2143.01.) Applicant traverses the rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Although Applicants believe that claims 11, 31, 51, and 71 are patentable as written, claims 11, 31, 51, and 71 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 18-20, 38-40, 58-60, and 78-80, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 21, 41, and 61 are in condition for allowance. Claims 12-16, 32-36, 52-56, and 72-76 properly depend from claims 11, 31, 51, and 71, respectively, and thus are in condition for allowance as well.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all grounds for rejection have been properly accomodated. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 10/30/2003

Jan Carol Little-Washington
Jan Carol Little-Washington
Reg. No. 41,181

FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on October 30, 2003
Date of Deposit

CHRISTINA FERNANDEZ

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Christina Fernandez October 30, 2003
Signature Date